

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

10 SUSAN M. CORTEZ

CASE NO. C12-385-RSL

11 Plaintiff,

AGREED ORDER FOR EAJA
FEES AND EXPENSES

12 v.
13 MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, COMMISSIONER,
14 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant,

15
16

17
18 THIS MATTER having come on regularly before the undersigned upon the parties= Stipulation for Award to Attorney=s Fees and Costs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. ' 2412, and Itemization of Services and Time for EAJA Fees, and Costs, and Expenses to Plaintiff, and the Court agreeing that EAJA fees and expenses should be awarded, good cause having been shown now, therefore, it is hereby

23 ORDERED that Plaintiff is hereby awarded EAJA fees of \$6926.62, and \$17.85 in
24 expenses. Subject to any offset allowed under the Treasury Offset Program, as
25 discussed in Astrue v. Ratliff, 130 S. Ct. 2521 (2010), payment of this award shall be
26 made via check sent to Richard Baum=s address: 119 N. Commercial St., Ste. 191,
Bellingham, WA 98225.

1

2

3 After the Court issues the order for EAJA fees and expenses, the Commissioner
4 will consider the matter of Plaintiff=s assignment of EAJA fees and expenses to Plaintiff=s
5 attorney. Pursuant to Astrue v. Ratliff, the ability to honor the assignment will depend on
6 whether the EAJA fees and expenses are subject to any offset allowed under the Treasury
7 Offset Program. The Commissioner agrees to contact the Department of Treasury after
8 the order for EAJA fess and expenses is entered to determine whether the EAJA fees and
9 expenses are sujект to any offset. If the EAJA fees and expenses are not subject to any
10 offset, the EAJA attorney=s fees and expenses will be paid directly to the order of
11 plaintiff=s attorney Richard Baum.

12

13 DATED this 13th day of February, 2013.

14

15

16



Robert S. Lasnik

United States District Judge

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26